4.4 Noise

4.4.1 Environmental Setting

Affected Environment

Modified Project activities would occur within TRTP Segments 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11, with selective structural modifications, when needed (Note: Construction within Segment 8A in the City of Chino Hills is stayed.). The setting discussion provided in Final EIR and Final EIS Section 3.10.2 remains valid and representative of ambient noise conditions occurring along TRTP segments where Modified Project activities would occur. The results and locations of recorded ambient noise measurements within these segments are provide in Final EIR and Final EIS Table 3.10-2. Further details of both long-term and short-term ambient noise measurements are provided in Final EIR and Final EIS Appendix K (Noise Technical Report).

Noise-Sensitive Receptors

The discussion of sensitive receptors along TRTP Segments 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11, as presented in Final EIR and Final EIS Section 3.10.2.2, remains generally valid. The environmental setting of these segments continues to vary from rural and undeveloped to urban, with noise-sensitive land uses including school facilities, churches, medical facilities, park facilities and recreational lands, cemetery use, and residential homes. Notable changes since the Final EIR and Final EIS were completed include:

- Within Segment 5, the planned Ritter Ranch housing development was partially graded, but not built. The Anaverde residential development is now partially built and occupied.
- Within Segment 8A, the planned Pine Valley Estates residential development is now partially built and occupied.

While there may be additional new sensitive receptors located in close proximity to TRTP Segments 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11 since the Final EIR and Final EIS were published, those numbers would be small in comparison to these larger residential development projects.

4.4.2 Applicable Laws, Regulations, and Standards

While Modified Project activities were not previously evaluated, they do not introduce new types of noise sources that would have applicable regulations other than those already documented in Final EIR and Final EIS Section 3.10.3. The following identifies whether there are any newly promulgated federal, State, or local regulations that were not in effect or have been updated since the Final EIR and Final EIS were issued.

Federal

No new federal regulations specific to Modified Project noise sources have been promulgated. All federal laws, regulations, and standards relevant to Noise, as described in Final EIR and Final EIS Section 3.10.3, remain applicable to Modified Project activities.

State

No new State regulations specific to Modified Project noise sources have been promulgated. All State laws, regulations, and standards relevant to noise, as described in Final EIR and Final EIS Section 3.10.3, remain applicable to Modified Project activities.

Local

Many local General Plan policies and Municipal Code ordinances aimed to reduce noise impacts are identified within Final EIR and Final EIS Section 3.10. All applicable policies and ordinances were identified and the TRTP was analyzed for consistency in Final EIR and Final EIS Table 3.10-9. The Modified Project activities analyzed herein do not include any activity within Kern County, with the exception of one structure near Whirlwind Substation where aviation lighting has already been installed (see Figure 2.1-1h – Segment 10). As such, the local regulatory setting focuses on Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, and the affected cities contained within these counties.

A review of all relevant local regulations and noise performance standards applicable to TRTP Segments 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11 indicates that they remain valid and unchanged, as presented in Final EIR and Final EIS Table 3.10-9. However, since Final EIR and Final EIS publication, the City of Chino General Plan has been updated and includes new noise objectives applicable to Modified Project noise sources. These regulations were not evaluated within Final EIR and Final EIS Table 3.10-9, but are evaluated herein within Section 4.4.4 and Table 4.4-2.

4.4.3 Impact Analysis Approach

The impacts identified in this SEIR/SEIS are determined by comparing the impacts of the Approved Project, as disclosed in the Final EIR and Final EIS, to the impacts of the Approved Project with the implementation of the proposed modifications (i.e., Modified Project) (see Section 2.3).

4.4.3.1 Criteria for Determining Impact Significance

The aviation lights and marker balls, once installed, as well as engineering refinements within Segment 8, Phase 3 (refer to Section 2) would have no effect on the permanent operational noise analysis presented in Final EIR and Final EIS Section 3.10. However, routine maintenance of Modified Project components would include the replacement of marker balls over the 50-year life of the Project. As further discussed below under Impact N-1, marker ball replacement would occur infrequently and would be of short duration. Therefore, the analysis of Modified Project noise, which results from initial marker ball installation and replacement, is limited to temporary activities. Because marker ball replacement is temporary, but not considered a "construction" activity, this Modified Project activity requires a change in language to Final EIR and Final EIS Significance Criterion NOI1. While still evaluating temporary and periodic increases in noise (consistent with Final EIR and Final EIS Criterion NOI1) the word "construction" has been removed from Criterion NOI1 (and associated Impacts N-1 and N-2) within this SEIR/SEIS. No supplemental analysis of Criterion NOI2 (and associated Impacts N-3 and N-4), which address permanent changes to ambient noise levels in the vicinity of sensitive receptors, is required.

To satisfy CEQA requirements, conclusions are made regarding the significance of each identified impact that would result from the Modified Project. Noise impacts of the Modified Project would be considered significant and require mitigation if the following criterion is met:

- Criterion NOI1: A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of sensitive receptors above levels existing without the Project.

For purposes of this noise analysis, a predicted (modeled) change in ambient noise of 5 dBA (A-weighted decibels) or more is considered to be substantial (see Final EIR and Final EIS Section 3.10.4.1).

4.4.3.2 Approved Project Applicant-Proposed Measures (APMs)

APMs to reduce potential noise impacts are identified in Final EIR and Final EIS Table 3.10-8. Of those identified, only APMs NOI-1 (*Limit Hours and Days for Construction*), NOI-3 (*Advance Notification*), and NOI-4 (*Establish Toll Free Number*) are applicable to Modified Project activities. Modified Project components would not include the addition of noise-emitting equipment at Approved Project substations; therefore, APM NOI-2 (*Substation Noise Minimization*) is not applicable. The following impact analysis assumes APMs NOI-1, NOI-3, and NOI-4 will be implemented as part of the Modified Project.

4.4.3.3 Impact Assessment Methodology

The analysis herein describes the impacts of the Modified Project related to noise and determines whether implementation of the Modified Project would result in new or increase impacts. The analysis only focuses on changes in impacts from the Approved Project (as presented in the Final EIR and Final EIS) with the addition of the proposed modifications (i.e., Modified Project). The transmission structure lights and marker balls, once installed, as well as engineering refinements to 21 towers (refer to Section 2.3) would have no permanent or substantial effect on ambient noise conditions. Marker ball replacement would occur similar to that of initial installation, which is a short-term and temporary activity that would not permanently increase the existing ambient noise conditions. Therefore, the analysis of noise is limited to temporary activities (per revised Criterion NOI1).

As discussed in Section 4.4.3.1, this SEIR/SEIS analysis has modified the language of Significance Criterion NOI (and Impacts N-1 and N-2) to address temporary noise generated by both Modified Project construction and O&M activities. Furthermore, this analysis is focused on any additional incremental noise associated with Modified Project activities. In evaluating potential changes, the impact analysis responds to the following questions for each impact statement discussion:

- Will the Project changes result in impacts not already identified in the Final EIR and Final EIS? If there are any new impacts, are they significant?
- Will the Project changes substantially increase the severity of any significant impacts identified in the Final EIR and Final EIS?
- Is there additional feasible mitigation available to reduce or avoid the significant impacts associated with the Project changes?

For the purposes of satisfying CEQA requirements, the significance of each impact statement are identified according to the following classifications: Class I: Significant impact; cannot be mitigated to a level that is less than significant; Class II: Significant impact; can be mitigated to a level that is less than significant; Class III: Adverse impact; less than significant; and Class IV: Beneficial impact.

4.4.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Direct and Indirect Effects Analysis

Substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of sensitive receptors above existing levels (Criterion NOI1)

Impact N-1: Temporary noise would substantially disturb sensitive receptors.

Construction. Installation of marker balls and aviation lights would occur during ongoing construction of the TRTP. Marker balls would be installed along the spans of overhead ground wire using either light duty helicopters or in limited circumstances a spacer cart. Marker ball installation conducted by light duty helicopters typically occurs by human external cargo (HEC). For HEC installation, a worker would be harnessed to the end of a cargo line at the nearest helicopter staging area. Once airborne, the worker is transported carrying one individual marker ball to the catenary span for quick installation. Individual marker ball installation occurs quickly, requiring only minutes for attachment. The primary noise source is from the helicopter, within the Approved Project ROW, as the helicopter hovers while marker balls are installed. Noise from spacer cart installation is primarily limited to mobilization activities and equipment removal upon completion of marker ball installation along a span.

Minimal additional activity would be associated with installation of aviation lights and engineering refinements because these activities would generally occur concurrently with installation of each tower structure. The additional construction activities, including additional helicopter flights and mobilization of ground-based crews, have the ability to affect noise levels along TRTP Segments 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11. As discussed in Section 2, Modified Project activities would be limited in duration, with helicopters utilizing previously approved helicopter staging areas.

Modified Project activities would not introduce any new construction equipment beyond that already being utilized for Approved Project construction. Helicopter types utilized for Modified Project activities would be similar or identical to those used for Approved Project wire stringing operations and construction/wreck-out. Therefore, construction equipment noise levels would be similar or identical to that presented in Final EIR and Final EIS Table 3.10-4, which is reproduced in Table 4.4-1 for reference.

As shown in Table 4.4-1, Modified Project construction would result in periodic noise levels ranging from greater than 83 dBA at 50 feet to 52 dBA at approximately 3,200 feet from the source. The primary noise source of Modified Project construction would occur during helicopter transit and use. As discussed in Final EIR and Final EIS Section 3.10, helicopter use would generate substantial noise affecting nearby sensitive receptors. Available data indicate that the sound exposure level (SEL) from the overflight of one heavy-duty helicopter flying at an elevation of 1,000 feet would likely be in the range of 85 dBA to 93 dBA; light-duty helicopters would generate an SEL of 80 dBA to 85 dBA

Table 4.4-1 Estimated Construction Equipment Noise Levels Versus Distance

Distance from ROW or Substation Property Line (feet)	Leq Noise Level (dBA)
50	>83.0
100	79.0
200	74.0
400	69.0
800	63.0
1,600	58.0
3,200	52.0
6,400	<46.0

Definition: dBA – A-weighted decibel.
Source: CPUC, 2009a (Final EIR) and Forest Service, 2010b (Final EIS).

(CH2MHill, 2007). Sensitive receptors located in proximity to helicopter staging areas, worksites, and along low flying helicopter flight paths would be subject to noise from helicopter use. Additionally, helicopter noise within TRTP Segments 6 and 11 in the ANF, all regional and local parks, and other recreational areas along the TRTP alignment containing Modified Project activities, would potentially disturb recreationists.

Modified Project activities would not introduce any new construction equipment beyond that already utilized for Approved Project construction. Therefore, because no new construction equipment would be introduced, no new significant construction noise sources would occur. When determining if the Modified Project activities would substantially increase construction equipment noise levels over that of the Approved Project, one must consider the logarithmic scale used to describe noise levels. When two equivalent noise sources occur simultaneously, the additive noise level increases by only 3 (dB), as values cannot be directly added or subtracted. As such, it would require a doubling of noise source strength (e.g., twice as many construction equipment in use) to produce a 3 dB increase in average construction noise. As discussed in Section 4.4.3.1, intermittent construction noise may be substantial over short durations if increases greater than 5 dBA would occur. This threshold is also used when determining if the increased use of construction equipment associated with the Modified Project is substantially greater than that of the Approved Project. Appendix B (Air Quality Calculations) identifies Modified Project construction equipment use by hour. The increased use of Modified Project construction equipment (primarily helicopter flight hours) is not substantial when compared against the total hours of similar construction equipment use associated with the Approved Project (within Modified Project segments). No substantial noise increase would occur as a result of Modified Project construction/wreck-out activities. As discussed in Section 4.4.6, the Modified Project is anticipated to result in less than a 10 percent increase in helicopter use. Therefore, construction equipment noise levels and impact assessment would be similar or identical.

Modified Project activities would, however, increase the frequency of temporary noise exceedances over ambient conditions at sensitive receptor locations. The increase in temporary noise occurrences is primarily associated with an increase in light duty helicopter trips. Implementation of the Final EIR and Final EIS mitigation measures listed below would reduce construction noise impacts to the maximum degree feasible. Therefore, the Modified Project would not substantially increase the severity of construction noise or change the determinations identified in the Final EIR and Final EIS. No new impacts would occur and no additional mitigation is required.

Operation and Maintenance. It is assumed that marker ball replacement would occur utilizing the same method as initial installation, which for the majority of the marker balls would occur by helicopter. During initial installation, up to 20 marker balls would be installed per day (SCE, 2012b). Because marker balls would likely fade or deteriorate at a similar pace along adjacent spans, it is assumed that up to 20 marker balls would be replaced at a time as a worst-case scenario for maintenance. Worst-case noise generated during marker ball replacement would be similar or identical to that described for initial installation. As marker ball replacement could occur at the rate of 20 per day, any sensitive receptor located near a T/L span having marker balls would be subjected to very infrequent periods of brief noise. Since this activity would not be generated until 10 to 25 years after initial marker ball installation, this noise analysis cannot account for any helicopter engine improvements or changes to marker ball installation techniques that may reduce the estimated noise. Furthermore, this analysis cannot account for changes to adjacent sensitive receptors at the time of

marker ball replacement. Implementation of the Final EIR and Final EIS mitigation measures listed below would reduce O&M noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

Approved Project Mitigation Measures for Impact N-1

N-1a Implement Best Management Practices for construction noise.

N-1b Avoid sensitive receptors during mobile construction equipment use.

CEQA Significance Conclusion

The Modified Project would not introduce any new noise sources beyond those utilized by the Approved Project. Noise levels would be similar or identical to those analyzed in the Final EIR and Final EIS. The Modified Project activities would nominally increase the frequency of significant temporary noise events impacting sensitive receptors resulting in a less-than-significant contribution (Class III). However, the Project would continue to result in significant temporary increases over ambient noise levels at sensitive receptor locations proximate to temporary construction and O&M activities (Class I), as discussed in the Final EIR. Implementation of the Modified Project would not result in new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of impacts previously identified in the Final EIR and Final EIS.

Impact N-2: Temporary noise levels would violate local standards.

Construction. As discussed under Impact N-1, while Modified Project activities would nominally increase the frequency of temporary noise events exceeding ambient conditions, they would not increase the decibel levels of utilized construction equipment (as presented in Table 4.4-1). Therefore, Modified Project construction activities would not alter the construction noise consistency analysis provided in Final EIR and Final EIS Table 3.10-9 for all affected jurisdictions applicable to TRTP Segments 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11. It should be noted that aircraft operations, including helicopters, are not subject to local noise regulations; therefore, permanent or temporary noise levels associated with Modified Project helicopter operations do not violate local standards. The FAA maintains sole jurisdiction over sounds emitted by aircraft, including helicopter use. FAA does regulate how loud a particular size helicopter can be as part of its certification process, but does not establish limits for acceptable ground level noise. As such, helicopter noise does not violate any local standards, though expected levels from helicopter use may, at times, exceed the standards local authorities have established for construction-related activities.

Since Final EIR and Final EIS publication, the City of Chino General Plan has been updated and introduces new noise polices applicable to the Modified Project. Table 4.4-2 provides a consistency analysis of these new regulations with respect to Modified Project activities.

Final EIR and Final EIS Mitigation Measures N-1a and N-1b (as identified above in Impact N-1) would reduce construction noise impacts to the maximum degree feasible. As discussed within Impact N-1, the Modified Project would not substantially increase the severity of construction noise levels. Therefore, the Modified Project would not change the local noise standard consistency determinations identified in the Final EIR and Final EIS Table 3.10-4. Furthermore, the Modified Project is compliant with newly introduced noise polices applicable to the Modified Project (as shown in Table 4.4-2). No new impacts would occur and no additional mitigation is required.

Table 4.4-2. Noise Policy Compliance Table – Construction	
Applicable Policy	Compliance Analysis
City of Chino General Plan	
Objective N-1.3 Control sources of construction noise. Policy P1. The City shall require a noise monitoring plan to be prepared and submitted prior to starting all construction projects. The noise monitoring plan shall identify monitoring locations and frequency, instrumentation to be used, and appropriate noise control measures that will be incorporated.	This General Plan objective and policy is intended for construction projects under City of Chino jurisdiction. The TRTP is under the jurisdiction of the CPUC. Through the CPUC approval process, APMs NOI-1, NOI-2, NOI-3, NOI-4 and Mitigation Measures N-1a and N-1b (see Appendix C) were included within the Approved Project Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program to reduce noise impacts during construction to the maximum extent feasible. The Modified Project would adhere to these same approved APM's and mitigation measures, as applicable; therefore, the Modified Project is considered compliant with the intent of this City of Chino General Plan objective and policy.
Objective N-1.3 Control sources of construction noise. Policy P2. The City shall limit all construction in the vicinity of noise sensitive land uses, such as residences, hospitals, or senior centers, to daylight hours or 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. In addition, the following construction noise control measures shall be included as requirements at construction sites to minimize construction noise impacts: Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. Ensure that during construction, trucks and equipment are running only when necessary. Shield all construction equipment with temporary noise barriers to reduce construction-related noise impacts. Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction area. Utilize "quiet" air compressors and similar equipment, where available.	With implementation of APM NOI-1, SCE would ensure that construction activities would either comply with local noise ordinances pertaining to daily construction activity timing or would obtain a variance from each affected jurisdiction if there is a need to work outside of normal daytime, weekday hours. Additionally, implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1a and N-1b would ensure that construction activities would utilize best management practices. As such, Modified Project activities would be compliant with this City of Chino General Plan objective and policy.

Source: City of Chino, 2010.

Operation and Maintenance. Because noise from marker ball replacement would not be generated until 10 to 25 years after initial marker ball installation, the noise policy analysis provided within Table 4.4-2 does not account for any changes to applicable policies or performance standard thresholds that may be applicable at the time of replacement. However, it is assumed that should helicopters be utilized for marker ball replacement, any sensitive receptor located near a Project span(s) requiring marker ball replacement would be subject to brief periods of noise greater than ambient conditions and likely not compliant with applicable policies, similar or identical to those presented within Table 4.4-2 and Final EIR and Final EIS Table 3.10-9. Implementation of Final EIR and Final EIS Mitigation Measures N-1a and N-1b during marker ball replacement would reduce O&M noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

CEQA Significance Conclusion

Temporary noise associated with Modified Project activities would continue to result in short-term, but substantial increases over ambient levels at sensitive receptor locations and would not be compliant with several local standards. However, the Modified Project would not substantially increase the severity of temporary noise levels or change the local noise standard consistency determinations identified in the

Final EIR and Final EIS. As shown in Table 4.4-2, Modified Project impacts to newly promulgated noise polices would be less-than-significant (Class III). However, the Project would continue to temporarily violate several applicable local noise ordinances and standards resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact (Class I), as discussed in the Final EIR. Implementation of the Modified Project would not result in new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of impacts previously identified in the Final EIR and Final EIS.

4.4.5 Cumulative Effects Analysis

Geographic Extent

The geographic extent for cumulative impact analysis related to noise is limited to areas within approximately 0.25 mile of Modified Project activities. This geographic area would also account for helicopter noise, as helicopter transit and operations would occur between approved staging areas and work sites within these Approved Project segments. At distances greater than 0.25 mile from Modified Project activity areas, impulse or passing helicopter noise would be briefly audible and steady short-term noise would generally dissipate into quiet background noise levels. Therefore, only projects within 0.25 mile of Modified Project activities and those that are scheduled concurrently are considered as projects that could contribute to cumulative impacts.

Existing Cumulative Conditions

Land use within 0.25 mile of Modified Project activity areas varies from rural to urban. Segments 7 and 8, located south of the ANF, is a highly urbanized area with the greatest potential for cumulative development to increase ambient noise levels as additional future development projects are approved and population growth occurs.

Ambient Noise Levels. With the exception of the ANF, ambient noise levels along Modified Project activity areas will continue to increase as man-made noise sources continually develop and intensify. These increases are mainly due to increased road-way traffic, air traffic, and other human activity. Approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable projects would add to the future expected noise levels throughout the cumulative geographic area. However, varying noise levels would continue to occur depending on the proximity to human activity. Rural communities or unpopulated lands will remain the quietest.

Noise-Sensitive Receptors. Approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable residential and urban infill projects will introduce and induce new sensitive receptors and increase population within areas along Modified Project activity areas.

Reasonably Foreseeable Future Projects and Changes

Only those projects listed in Section 3, Figures 3.5-1a through 3.5-1c, that have been identified within 0.25 mile of Modified Project activity areas and that have the potential for temporally overlapping construction schedules are considered potential cumulative projects. There are a limited number of projects listed in Section 3, Figures 3.5-1a through 3.5-1c, that are within the geographic extent for noise. As the construction schedule of many of these projects is uncertain, there is the potential that these projects may have construction periods coincident with that of the Modified Project. As discussed below, because marker ball replacement would not commence until 10 to 25 years after initial marker ball

installation, cumulative projects listed in Section 3 cannot account for those proximate during marker ball replacement.

Cumulative Impact Analysis

- **Temporary noise would substantially disturb sensitive receptors (Impact N-1)**. Modified Project activities would result in temporary, but substantial increases to ambient noise levels and would disturb proximate sensitive receptors. Similarly, activities associated with other projects within 0.25 mile of Modified Project activities could potentially occur at the same time and cumulatively increase temporary noise level impacts. Sensitive receptors located adjacent to multiple project sites could potentially experience increased temporary noise impacts over those only created by Modified Project activities. Since marker ball replacement would not commence until 10 to 25 years after initial marker ball installation, this cumulative noise analysis cannot account for cumulative projects that may be proximate and contribute cumulatively to temporary noise generated by marker ball replacement. Furthermore, this analysis cannot account for changes to adjacent sensitive receptors at the time of marker ball replacement. However, when Modified Project activities and other nearby projects occur concurrently, it is expected that the combined effect of short-term noise would be cumulatively significant. Modified Project activities would increase the frequency of significant temporary noise impacts to sensitive receptors over ambient conditions. Therefore, the combined effect of temporary noise from the Modified Project and that generated by other projects could be cumulatively significant at various times during construction (Class I). However, Modified Project activities do not substantially increase the severity of cumulative construction noise effects or change the cumulative construction noise impact determination identified in the Final EIR and Final EIS.

  As discussed in the 2010 Supplemental EIS (Forest Service, 2010a), the 2009 Station Fire would not change the overall noise impacts of the Project. From a cumulative stand point, additional noise sources could result from activities associated with post-fire re-construction and repair activities; however, only a limited number of facilities which were damaged or destroyed by the Station Fire are within audible distance from Segments 6 and 11. Furthermore, there are a limited number of projects which would be considered reasonably foreseeable given uncertainties of funding and timing. These factors result in a less-than-significant (Class III) potential for noise from these projects to combine with the noise resulting from the Modified Project activities.

- **Temporary noise levels would violate local standards (Impact N-2)**. Modified Project construction activities would continue to violate several applicable local noise standards. As discussed in Section 4.4.4, it should be noted that aircraft operations, including helicopters, are not subject to local noise regulations; therefore, permanent or temporary noise levels associated with Modified Project helicopter operations do not violate local standards. ~~Similarly, c~~Construction activities associated with cumulative projects within 0.25 mile of Modified Project activities could potentially occur at the same time, and also violate local standards. Should Modified Project construction activities and other nearby projects occur concurrently, the combined effect of construction noise would be cumulatively significant. Therefore, the combined effect of construction noise from the Modified Project and construction of other projects would be cumulatively significant at various times during construction and violate local standards (Class I). However, the Modified Project would not substantially increase the severity of construction noise levels or change the local noise standard consistency determinations identified in the Final EIR and Final EIS. Furthermore, as shown in Table 4.4-2, the Modified Project impact to newly promulgated noise polices would be less-than-significant (Class III).

  Because noise from marker ball replacement would not be generated until 10 to 25 years after initial marker ball installation, the noise policy analysis provided within Table 4.4-2 does not account for any changes to applicable policies or performance standard thresholds that may be applicable at the time of replacement. However, it is assumed that should helicopters be utilized for marker ball replacement, any sensitive receptor located near a span requiring marker ball replacement would be subjected to brief periods of noise greater than ambient conditions resulting in violation(s) of local noise policies (Class I) similar or identical to those presented within Final EIR and Final EIS Table 3.10-9. However, Modified Project activities do not substantially increase the severity of cumulative temporary noise effects or change the cumulative noise impact determination identified in the Final EIR and Final EIS with respect to violating local standards. The Station Fire does not alter this conclusion or affect the nature or magnitude of local noise standards or the Modified Project's contribution to this cumulative effect.

Mitigation to Reduce the Project's Contribution to Significant Cumulative Effects

There are no additional feasible mitigation measures that could be imposed on the Modified Project to further reduce its contribution to cumulative noise effects. All feasible noise mitigation measures have been recommended to mitigate Impacts N-1 and N-2 (Mitigation Measures N-1a and N-1b).

4.4.6 Comparison of Alternatives

This comparison of alternatives focuses on the differences between the Approved Project (No Project Modifications/No Action Alternative) and the changes that would result with implementation of the Modified Project. Table 4.4-3 provides a side-by-side comparison, summarizing the analysis presented above in Sections 4.4.4 and 4.4.5.

Table 4.4-3. Comparison of Alternatives – Noise

Project Component / Impact	Approved Project [1] (No Project / No Action Alternative)	Modified Project
Structures with Aviation Lights	0	90
T/L Spans with FAA Marker Balls	0	276
Total Marker Balls	0	2,248
Max. Helicopter Hours/Day	141	151
Helicopter Use – Working Hours	13,971	14,799 (828 additional)
Total Helicopter Use (includes idle hours)	15,317	16,500 (1,183 additional)
Potential for construction noise to substantially disturb sensitive receptors	Sensitive noise receptors within close proximity to construction activities would be disturbed by substantial construction noise (i.e., result in an ambient noise increase of at least 5 dBA [A-weighted decibels]).	No new construction equipment beyond that analyzed for the Approved Project; therefore, no increase in equipment noise levels. However, additional helicopter activities, which account for a 4% increase in daily helicopter use, would contribute to an increase in the number of temporary noise disturbances during construc-tion. Additional helicopter noise would not result in a substantial increase in construction noise levels.
Potential for construction noise levels to violate local standards.	Construction would not comply with noise ordinances adopted by the Cities of Baldwin Park, Duarte, La Habra Heights, Pasadena, and South El Monte.	Modified Project would result in the same conflicts with local standards. No new areas would be impacted.
Cumulative noise impacts	Construction noise would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative contribution to temporary noise disturbing sensitive receptors.	No substantial change in the contribution to cumulative effects compared to the Approved Project.

1 – The Approved Project is based on the originally approved overhead design.